

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 13, 15 and 19-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims. By this Amendment, claims 2, 6, 10, 14 and 18 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3, 13, 15 and 21 are amended. No new matter is added.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-3, 6, 10, 13-15 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,570,290 to Kazmierczak. As claims 2, 6, 10, 14 and 18 are cancelled, the rejection of those claims is moot. The rejection of claims 1, 3, 13, 15 and 19-21 is respectfully traversed.

Kazmierczak relates to single phase or polyphase electrical machines, and more particularly, to single layer interspersed concentric stator winding patterns for turbine generators. In Kazmierczak, the turbine generator includes a stator 10 having a plurality of slots 14. Slot center lines are disposed at equal angles around the stator as shown in Fig. 1. An armature winding is formed by conductors or coil sides which are received in slots 14 of the stator 10. Each stator slot 14 contains a top layer coil side 18a-18c and a bottom layer coil side 20a-20c. Each top layer coil side is connected to the bottom layer coil side displaced by a full or fractional pole pitch from the top layer coil side to form a coil. Fig. 8 of Kazmiercz shows a 2-pole three-phase winding pattern for a turbine generator where the phase windings C and A are displaced 120 and 240 electrical degrees, respectively, from the B winding (col. 8, lines 37-40).

It is alleged in the Office Action (without evidentiary support) that Kazmierczak discloses the claimed “long motor”. However, as discussed above, Kazmierczak clearly relates to a turbine generator and therefore, does not disclose a “long motor” as alleged. It is also

alleged in the Office Action (without evidentiary support) that Kazmierczak discloses all of the features recited in the dependent claims.

Applicants respectfully remind the Examiner that anticipation requires that each and every element of the rejected claim is found, either inherently or expressly described in a single prior art reference (MPEP § 2131). Further, in rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified (37 CFR §1.104).

However, in the outstanding rejection of the pending claims, no structure is pointed out in the applied reference that is alleged to compare to the subject matter recited in the rejected claims. Rather, the Examiner merely restates the claim language and makes the conclusory statement that each of the claimed elements are disclosed in the applied reference.

Notwithstanding the deficiencies of the Office Action in failing to point out corresponding structure and clearly explaining the pertinence of the reference in rejecting the claims, Applicants submit that Kazmierczak fails to disclose or suggest “three cable windings are arranged in one layer as a three-phase winding, and the layers formed in this way are arranged one above the other, and two three-phase windings, arranged one above the other, are in each case offset through 180° with respect to one another.” In fact, the only mention of an angle of any type is the electrical angle describing the electric phase displacement of the respective phase windings A, B, C discussed above.

Because *prima facie* anticipation has not been established for each and every feature recited in the rejected claims and because Kazmierczak fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in the rejected claims, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John W. Fitzpatrick at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

  
John W. Fitzpatrick, Reg. No. 41,018

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

DJD/JWF/kas